

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/Pers				
14	D/OLL				
15	D/PAO	X			
16	SA/IA				
17	AO/DCI				
18	C/IPD/OIS				
19					
20					
21					
22					
SUSPENSE		Date			

Remarks
Appropriate disposition. Two (2)
Letters (DCI & DDCI)

SAC
Executive Secretary
29 oct 84
Date

3637 (10-81)

World Peace

Association, Inc.

615 Ashbourne Road, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania 19117, U.S.A.
215 635-2893

October 25, 1984

Mr. William J. Casey, Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, DC 20505

You are one of about 3000 to whom this first issue of the "World Peace Report" is directed. It is and will remain free unless the cost becomes too burdensome.

I have an objective -- to solve a problem with you. It is a very important problem, affecting all of us, but I don't know the solution; nor, for that matter, is it clear that there is a solution. But the greater the number of responsible people who consider the problem, then the greater the likelihood that something innovative and satisfying will appear, and, perhaps just as important, the greater the appreciation and support for such a "good" solution.

The problem, expressed in general terms, is heard quite frequently: international conflict represents the greatest danger to our species, and that danger would diminish if nations, or their power, were de-emphasized. Stated more pointedly: how can we reduce the domination of the nation-state in world affairs?

The solution is most difficult because almost all citizens in all countries have been imprinted, since childhood, with the desire and need to support their country. Until recently this must be regarded as having been a favorable trait, since each nation-state is a cultural experiment, stronger and more likely to survive if supported by its populace. The nations, in their struggle to excel, have most appropriately been termed "the mighty engines of civilization."

Over half of you are government officials, chosen from every country. If I were in your position, I am quite certain I would regard the security of my country as my ultimate concern, and any threat, however remote, would engage my primary attention. So we have another difficulty: the political decision-makers, who must be the leaders in de-emphasizing the nation-states, are the ones most dedicated to upholding them. Can they all, simultaneously, recognize a higher allegiance, one necessary to preserve their nation-state?

I point to the system of nation-states as the problem, and hope, through this medium, that we uncover a feasible solution -- readily recognized and universally salutary.

L. Starobin
L. Starobin

LS:hgt

DCI
EXEC
REG

L-304

WORLD PEACE REPORT

An attempt to share information on the causes and available cures of international war.

Editor: L. Starobin, World Peace Association, Inc., 615 Ashbourne Road, Elkins Park, Pa. 19117, U.S.A.

Vol. 1, No. 1: October, 1984

WHOLE EARTH OLYMPICS

The heading is the title of Flora Lewis' article on the New York Times' Op-ed page of July 26. She seeks to "return the (Olympic) competition to sport for sport's sake" and to "reverse the tide of nationalism, which has risen even faster than the perception of the mutual dependence and common needs of the world's peoples."

Successive boycotting of the African countries, the western bloc and the eastern bloc, have ravaged the last three Olympic games. The actors are all nation-states, and their actions were dictated by their desire to punish an enemy, another nation-state, and thereby modify the enemy's future behavior.

Every contestant is in the uniform of a nation-state, the gold medal winners weep as they hear their national anthems, and the scoring is summarized by listing the medals acquired by each country. There could hardly be an environment more conducive to the generation of intense nationalism — not only within the psyche of the contestants and their entourages, but also in the huge audiences at the sites and on television.

Of course the entire Olympic process is conducted by delegates of the nation-states, and each is charged with the task of contributing as much as possible to his country's success. Success, more than anything else, means the impression of a superior culture. So the processes invoked by the Olympics are not among the causes of nationalism, they only confirm and strengthen existing nationalism — as would any other process conducted by the nation-state.

What is the alternative? In the context of the Olympics, it is hard to imagine any organizing element other than the nation-state. There must be some means of selecting the athletes and their trainers, providing training facilities, and providing the members of the various administrative committees. Even if the site of the games were fixed, perhaps in Athens, or each competition had a fixed location with permanent facilities, such as downhill skiing in Chamonix, cross-country skiing in Lake Placid, ice skating in Calgary and tobogganing in Zermatt, the nation-state would remain as the principal actor.

RE: SOLUTIONS

We repeat (it will soon become tiresome) that we know the problem, but not the solution. We know that nations are the cause of international war, but we don't know how to modify nations in a manner that will remove the cause, and thereby eliminate international war.

If there is to be any continuing feature of this periodical, it will be a review of proffered solutions. Most issues will discuss one or more new suggestions, and also recall those made previously. The reason for doing this is simply to generate more solutions, both by the stimulation from examples and by new combinations of the suggestions made in the past.

There could be no better place to start than the paper, "Alternative International Security Systems" in the June, 1983 issue of *Peace Research, The Canadian Publication of Peace Studies*, by Hanna Newcombe. She is a founding member of the Peace Research Institute in Dundas, Ontario, Canada, and has contributed many insightful analyses over the years. Her list, having ten alternatives for international security, may be regarded as "state-of-the-art," although, it seems to me, implementation of most of them is possible only under the pressure of an imminent war.

First, Dr. Newcombe claims that existing UN arms control and treaty systems are only partial cures, what is needed is radical and precipitous innovation. Her list is as follows:

1. *No-First-Use World*. Every country would pledge no-first-use of nuclear weapons. But how could the pledges be made credible? The weapons are still in place, ready for use.

Continued on next page

All this means that the nation-state performs certain vital functions better, in our cultural evolution, than any other social subsystem. How, then, do we preserve its efficiency, and its ability to test its version of culture, and yet remove its power to destroy *Homo sapiens*?

RE: SOLUTIONS (continued)

2. *Minimum Deterrence World.* Only a very few missiles, say 10, are allowed since they are a sufficient deterrent: each could destroy a city. Infractions would be reported by the populace. No limits to conventional arms.
3. *Non-Aggressive World.* Only military defense allowed; ideally, an "all citizens defense" as is offered by the mobilization plans of Switzerland and Yugoslavia.
4. *Non-Nuclear World.* This means destroy all nuclear weapons whether "cold-turkey" or gradually. There may also be some reductions in conventional weapons.
5. *Disarmed or Demilitarized World.* The elimination of all military weapons and personnel so that only police forces would remain. This situation is regarded as unstable, since any violation could be quite rewarding. How to maintain stability in this demilitarized condition is the subject of the concluding five alternatives.
6. *The Non-Violent World.* Nation-states would maintain a defense capability by training the populace in Gandhian methods of resistance to an invader, employing disobedience and non-cooperation.
7. *The Functional Cooperation World.* Countries become enmeshed in such a host of ties — economic, ecological, postal, telephone, knowledge exchange, allocation of radio channels, sea mining, etc. — that the threatened loss of these benefits would prevent any military excursions.
8. *World Government Fully Armed.* The military power of all nations would be transferred to the world government. The great drawback: the world government can be tyrannical and, having all the power, impossible to unseat.
9. *Minimal World Government with General and Complete Disarmament.* The central world government has only enough power to prevent wars, nations are free to arrange their domestic affairs as they see fit.
10. *Maximal World Government with General and Complete Disarmament.* To alternative 9 would be added the usual governmental functions of maintaining internal order and providing for the general welfare of the citizenry.

Just as there is no way of preventing a conflict if its outcome must benefit one of the parties, so it is difficult to envision any of these ten scenarios because they all require the nations' consent to an international agreement reducing their sovereignty. The only possible exception is alternative 7, "The Functional Cooperation World," which may proceed in small bilateral and local agreements, similar to many existing treaties. It thereby provides not only an alternative, but a step-by-step means of moving "from here to there." Even in this scenario, however, there are major difficulties, readily observed in the European Economic Community (EEC). Here we have a regional community of nation-states, a legislature elected by all the citizens, a list of economic rules for exchanges, the guidance of some of the world's leading intellectuals, and a culturally homogeneous West European membership. Yet the last few years have seen little change except for members' threats of resignation.

The categorizations listed above appear to exhaust the alternatives, but innovative thinking always finds new ways to categorize and new alternatives.

WE'RE NOT DOING SO WELL

We never lacked pessimistic evaluations of our progress toward effective arms control and recently there has been an increase in such gloomy observations.

Let me note three cases:

1. The first is by Harold Brown, formerly US Secretary of Defense and Lynn E. Davis, now Professor of Military Strategy at the National War College, in the Summer 1984 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. After first reminding us of the benefits of arms control agreements they nevertheless warn us that "an agreement will probably not achieve all these aims, let alone...ending the risk of nuclear war — that have often been promised by the advocate of various arms proposals. Negotiations with the Soviet Union cannot be expected to produce in the foreseeable future nuclear force postures with fewer than many thousands of nuclear weapons. Nuclear war will still be possible and its catastrophic consequences will not be

THE BURIAL OF JOE POLOWSKY

Extracted from the New York Times of November 27, 1983

Three Russian and three American war veterans bore Joseph Polowsky to his grave in Torgau, East Germany, by the Elbe River, where, as a U.S. soldier, he helped liberate the town when the U.S. and Soviet Union forces met on April 25, 1945.

His grandparents were born in Minsk, Russia, and after the war he was a taxi driver in Chicago.

Moved by his experience in 1945, he crafted an "oath of the Elbe" to keep alive the fraternization between the two countries, and repeatedly petitioned the world leaders to promote peace and disarmament. Major General Gorlinsky of the Soviet Union, elderly and frail, and the Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Jr., Minister of the Riverside Church in New York, spoke to the small crowd in the chill rain. Rev. Coffin recalled the swords and plowshares passage from

Micah, and continued: "Joe Polowsky saw that no one nation is the center of this world. This is not the American century. This is not the Russian century. It will not be the Chinese century. This is the human century."

And he went on, but now his ministerial inspiration did not serve him as well: "Those farthest from the seats of power are nearest to the heart of things, and those of us who are farthest away from the seats of power have a much better chance of changing this world for the better if we will only stay true to the dream we're trying to keep before our eyes now." But the world will be changed only by those in power, and the dream will have to be theirs if it is to be realized.

changed." There follows an extensive analysis of the negotiating ploys of each side.

2. R. Jeffrey Smith, on the editorial staff of *Science*, wrote a page for the August 10 issue with the title "A Dim Future for Weapons Talks." Apparently the US negotiators hope the US threat of an advanced missile defense system will compel the Soviets "to accept an enormous reduction in the size and strength of their strategic nuclear force". A number of observers disagree, generally taking a diametrically opposite view. At a hearing attended by the Pentagon's director of research, Senator Sam Nunn asked him "Can you conceive of the Soviet Union developing a defensive system and as they develop it over the next 10 years, we would reduce our offensive capability? You would come in and say to President Reagan, 'Mr. President...they can shoot down so many of our missiles that I recommend we decrease our offensive effort.' ...I can't conceive of it." Among those concerned with our foreign relations, there is no firm agreement on issues, interactions or benefits.

3. William Eckhardt, in the May issue of *Peace Research (The Canadian Journal of Peace Studies)*, reviewed the published proceedings of the 25th anniversary meeting of the Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs held during July 1982. Started in 1957, with 22 scientists from ten countries, it now includes 2,000 scientists from 75 countries. The intent of the instigator, Cyrus Eaton, was to find a means of avoiding

nuclear war, and he enlisted the "best brains" to join in the effort.

But many of the articles noted that the danger of nuclear holocaust was now greater than in 1957, "in spite of...Pugwash and...the recent growth of public mass movement for peace and disarmament." The main culprit was frequently claimed to be the governments: "We will *never* have disarmament at their rate of negotiations." All this is based on an assumption, that arms cause wars — yet "they do not launch themselves, they must be procured and fired by the military through government orders." Then it is the *nature* of the governments which must be changed, not simply a particular behavior during a disarmament conference.

Eckhardt concludes in eloquent fashion:

This book reminds us of how much we have to learn. If so many efforts by so many people over so many years have not yet achieved success, there must be something we are missing or something we are not doing right. We do not know enough about the conditions for peace, or we do not know enough about how to achieve those conditions...

To me this is a restatement of the need frequently expressed here, to find the solution. But "the answer depends on the question," and the solution depends on the problem or, more usefully, how the problem is phrased. Here it is regarded as a truism that when we solve the problem of the behavior of the nation-state, we will have solved the problem of war.

BACTERIA NOW EAT NYLON BYPRODUCTS

Nylon is only 45 years old, but, according to *Science News* of May 19, bacteria now find the effluent of a nylon factory in Japan quite appetizing. The new capability is attributed to the change in the DNA of a plasmid which replicates with its bacterial host.

The mechanisms usually regarded as descriptive of the evolutionary process, such as mutation, seem much too slow to account for this development, as well as the many intricate features of a complicated organ like the eye or the larynx. There are two notable suggestions arising from the search for accelerating mechanisms:

1. A change in a hormone or enzyme, which, like a catalyst, affects the rate or terminal value of a chemical reaction. So a small change in a hormone may account for a large physiological change — e.g., the human brain size compared to ancestral primates.
2. A shift in the DNA stop code. The DNA code is a sequence of nucleic acid triplets. Since there are four different nucleic acids, there are 64 possible triplets. Three of these are "stop codes", and the other 61 are codes for one of 20 amino acids.

A protein, the basic chemical unit of life-forms, is a string of amino acids. A change in the DNA, say by loss of a single nucleic acid, changes the entire code, including the location of stop codes. Such a change in the DNA of the plasmid is believed to account for the new bacterial protein that "digests nylon". Industrial and research bacteriologists rely on such processes of change to "invent" new proteins and new fermentation products, using intricate techniques to isolate and multiply desired variants.

In a sense, the bacterium involved here, *Flavobacterium* Sp. K172, used this process to discover a means of digesting a new food source thereby invoking the typical problem-solving procedure of life forms. The life-form need not "know" a problem exists, and the solution, which can be how to digest a newly available food or how to avoid a lethal environment, is readily noted by the consequent increase in population.

Perhaps, in an equally unsophisticated manner, we are evolving a solution to the problem of rampant nationalism. This "technique" of discovery has served us in the ancient past, perhaps it needs a little boost now that the penalty for failure is so much greater.

PLEASE CONCENTRATE

The kernel of our nuclear difficulties is the conflict between the two superpowers, the US and Russia. If *this* conflict is resolved, at least 90% of the threat of annihilation to our species would be removed. If *all other* conflicts were resolved, only 10% of the threat would be removed; furthermore, we would reduce the variety offered by the multiplicity of cultures, needed for continued evolution.

Let's concentrate on the big payoff.

SPECIAL NOTE

1. You have a comment? A suggestion? Or, Most Blessed One, a solution? Remember this is a cooperative venture, so *please* send it to us. Your submission will be published if deemed pertinent, regardless of any position, pro or con. It must be short and we reserve the right to edit. Please address "The Editor, World Peace Report."
2. A paper, "The Nation-States and Peace," is available without charge from this office. It contains a more extended analysis of the problem with some very tentative solutions.
3. Feel free to quote anything you read here. Please keep it within the context and mention the source.
4. If you do not wish future copies, or your address is incorrect, please advise us, giving us also the name and address we used.
5. Let us have any suggested additions to our mailing list.

The purpose of this endeavor is to stimulate thought.

We will never:

- ask you to subscribe
- ask you for financial support
- make our mailing list available to others.

What we do ask is that you join with other international decision-makers in seeking solutions to the growing danger to our species. Humanity needs your moral and intellectual contribution.